ROUTE CONCEPT REPORT

ROUTE 68

IN

MONTEREY COUNTY

CALTRANS DISTRICT
5

1990
~~1986~~

Route 68

I approve this Route Concept Report as the guide toward which today's decisions and/or recommendations should be directed.

Approved:

JESUS M. GARCIA
District Director of
Transportation

Approved:

D. L. WIEMAN, Chief
Division of Transportation
Planning

Approved:

DONALD L. WATSON, Chief
Division of Highways and
Programming

Approved:

JACK KASSEL, Chief
Division of Project Development

ROUTE CONCEPT REPORT SUMMARY

ROUTE 68

MON - 0.0 TO 22.0

ROUTE CONCEPT:

Route 68 should be maintained or improved as indicated in the table below. A traffic Level of Service* C is recommended for the bulk of the route. Levels of Service E & F exist now and will remain for the segments in the Cities of Pacific Grove and Salinas due to projected increases in traffic and high environmental and socio-economic costs.

SEGMENT	P.M. to P.M.	CONCEPT LOS	PROP. IMPROVEMENT
No. 1	0.0 to L4.3 (Pacific Grove)	F-20	No significant change
No. 2	R4.0 to 19.4 (Monterey to Salinas)	C-45	Four-lane freeway
No. 3	19.4 to 22.0 (Salinas)	E-35	No significant change

It should be noted that the Concept LOS may not agree with any LOS established by the local planning agencies. The Concept LOS, for the most part, is based on present traffic conditions. In some instances, this may vary depending on traffic needs and/or financial and technical conditions.

Concept Rationale:

Route 68 is designated a principal arterial. It primarily serves regional traffic although recreational trips are high on weekends and summer months. The segment between Monterey and Salinas is the main commute artery between these two areas.

Areas of Concern:

Major developments are planned for the corridor between Salinas and Monterey. Increasing commute trips will cause a deterioration in the Level of Service in this segment unless the route is upgraded to a freeway. This segment now operates at LOS F.

Environmental and construction costs in the hilly Pacific Grove segment will be a detriment to any major improvement of the roadway. This segment now operates at LOS F.

The 4-lane urban segment in the City of Salinas probably would not be widened because of prohibitive right of way costs so operational improvements will have to suffice. This segment now operates at LOS E.

Improvements:

The purpose of this report is to establish a concept without describing specific improvements. Specific improvements will be addressed in a follow-up document - The Route Development Plan.

* Levels of Service are defined in the appendix of this report.

Route 68 Concept Report
P.M. 0.0 to P.M. L4.3 and
P.M. R4.0 to P.M. 22.0

PREFACE

The following represents Caltrans' District 5's format for route concept reports. Route Concept Reports follow a specific outline and are supported by Route Segment Data pages. You will find that practically all existing route data is shown on the Route Segment Data pages at the appropriate locations. Specific improvements and costs are not shown as they will be discussed in the upcoming route development plans.

The Route Concept Report (RCR) is a planning document which expresses the Department's judgment on what the characteristics of the state highway should be to respond to the projected travel demand over the 20-year planning period.

The RCR contains the Department's goal for the development of each route in terms of level of service and broadly identifies the nature and extent of improvements needed to reach those goals. The RCR then provides the basis for the preparation of route development plans and the system analysis which indicates the level of service provided on the system at a given level of funding.

Route Concept Reports are prepared in the districts and represent the combined expertise of district staff. Facility dimension (e.g., roadway widths or number of lanes on a multi-laned facility) discussed in the RCR represent an initial planning approach to scoping candidate improvement and determining estimated costs.

All information in the Route Concept Report is subject to change as conditions change and new information is obtained. Consequently, the nature and size of identified improvements may change as they move through the project development stages, with final determinations made at the time of project planning and design. If the nature and size of improvements change from that included in this report during later project development stages, this will be cause to review the Route Concept Report for this route.

In some cases, resurfacing, restoration and rehabilitation (3R) projects, will not adhere to the minimum concepts stated in this report. In these instances, exceptions to the minimum will be requested of the FHWA for funding purposes.

ROUTE 68

1. Route Description Within District 5

Route 68 within Monterey County is 22.0 miles in length. It is predominantly a 2-lane conventional highway except for 2 short freeway segments.

Route 68 begins near the Asilomar Conference Center in the City of Pacific Grove and continues southwesterly in a serpentine alignment until it merges with Route 1. It is contiguous with route 1 for 3 miles where it enters the City of Monterey. Route 68 splits off from Route 1 and continues easterly through City and County territory that contains an industrial park, golf courses, and residential development, but is still predominantly rural. There is a small freeway section in the City of Monterey as Route 68 and Route 1 diverge. The second freeway segment occurs at Reservation Road as Route 68 approaches the City of Salinas. At this point it widens to 4 lanes and continues as a 4-lane conventional highway through Salinas until it ends at the junction with Route 101.

2. Route Segmentation

This route has been divided into 3 segments. The segments are shown on the Route Segment location map and detailed information is given on the Route Segment Date pages. Route segments are based on district boundaries, county boundaries, change in functional classification, significant changes in terrain, etc.

3. Purpose of Route

The primary purpose of Route 68 in Pacific Grove and in Salinas is to serve regional traffic although recreational trips are high on weekends and summer months. The portion of Route 68 between Monterey and Salinas (18 miles) is a principal arterial. It is the chief link between the County's largest urbanized area (Monterey-Seaside) and the County seat of Salinas and it is the most direct route from the Monterey Peninsula to Southern California. Primary trip purposes are commute.

Route 68 is not a SHELL (State Highway Extra Legal Load) Route.

Route 68 is designated as a Federal Aid Primary route. In Pacific Grove it is a Federal Aid Urban route.

The various route functional classifications are listed on the attached Route Segment Data pages.

4. Existing Facilities

Refer to the Route Segment Data pages for current status (geometrics, traffic, accidents, etc.).

In the adopted 1986 STIP, under New Facilities and/or Operational Improvements there is one project scheduled for Route 68:

> MON-68-15.1-R16.8 - Near Salinas from 0.4 mile east of Torero Drive to 0.3 mile west of Reservation Road, construct freeway and interchange at Toro Park.

5. Present and Future Operating Conditions

Refer to the Route Segment Data pages for present and future operating conditions other than listed below.

Public Transit

Monterey-Salinas Transit serves the Monterey Peninsula area and the Salinas City area. Line #21 serves both cities via Route 68. The weekly total of passengers carried on this line is approximately 3,000. This does not have a significant effect on the operational characteristics of Route 68.

Rail Service

None

6. Concerns at the End of the STIP Period

The concerns shown on the Route Segment Data pages exist now and will not be solved, except within the areas of the above mentioned projects, during the current STIP period (1986-88 through 1990-91 fiscal years).

The Route Concept Report guidelines are based on existing operating speeds, level of service, and accident rates. Where the levels of the problem identification criteria are exceeded, it is shown on the Route Segment Data pages as an asterisk next to the appropriate item.

7. Future Concerns (6-20 Year Period)

Route Segment No. 1 in Pacific Grove will still have a capacity problem which will further deteriorate due to increased traffic.

Route Segment No. 2 between the Cities of Monterey and Salinas will be adversely impacted by increasing residential and commercial development. A combination of increased traffic, restricted sight distance, many access points, and slow moving vehicles will cause the level of service to further deteriorate.

Route Segment No. 3 in the City of Salinas will continue to have a capacity problem which will further deteriorate (from LOS E to LOS F) due to increased traffic.

8. Route Concept (2005)

Concept Level of Service (LOS)

Refer to the Route Segment Data pages for the Concept LOS.

Minimum Typical Cross Section

The minimum typical cross section will vary depending upon the segment involved.

Upgrading to freeway standards will be justified due to the increased level of development in the corridor between Monterey and Salinas.

Alignment Changes

When the existing route is upgraded to freeway standards; then alignment changes will be made at certain locations to conform to the current freeway agreement between the State and Monterey County.

9. Route Improvements

All proposed route improvements are listed on the attached Route Segment Data pages.

10. Alternate Route Concepts Considered

No alternate route concepts have been considered.

There is a Route Adoption signed by the California Highway Commission on April 23, 1958 for an alternate alignment on Route 68 from York Road to Reservation Road. The Commission had also signed a Freeway Agreement for the same segment on September 3, 1963.

There was also a Freeway Agreement for a new alignment from Reservation Road to Route 101 in the City of Salinas that was signed on October 15, 1962, but it was rescinded on September 18, 1975. After the rescission, the City of Salinas implemented a bypass route which serves traffic from Route 68 south of Salinas to Route 101 in North Salinas. This bypass will help relieve the heavy traffic on Route 68 (Main Street) through town.

An additional bypass of Route 68 operates in South Salinas. It connects Route 68, south of Salinas with Route 101 on the west side by using Blanco Road and South Sanborn Road.

APPENDIX

You will note that the term "Level of Service" (LOS) appears frequently within this report. Level of Service is a term used to describe the quality of operation of a highway facility. It is a qualitative measure of the effect of such factors as, speed and travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, driving comfort, convenience, safety and operating cost. It is based on peak traffic hours in this report. On urban street systems, the quality of flow is most frequently controlled by traffic conditions at signalized intersections. The flow characteristics at the six defined levels of service, A through F, can be described as follows:

LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS (Uninterrupted Traffic Flow)

Level of Service A (LOS A) describes a condition of free flow, with low volumes and high speeds. Traffic density is low, with speeds controlled by driver desires, speed limits, and physical roadway conditions.

Level of Service B (LOS B) is in the zone of stable flow, with operating speeds beginning to be restricted somewhat by traffic conditions. Drivers still have reasonable freedom to select their speed and lane of operation.

Level of Service C (LOS C) is still in the zone of stable flow, but speeds and maneuverability are more closely controlled by the higher volumes. Most of the drivers are restricted in their freedome to select their own speed, change lanes, or pass.

Level of Service D (LOS D) approaches unstable flow, with tolerable operating speeds being maintained though considerably affected by changes in operating conditions. Fluctuations in volumes and temporary restrictions to flow may cause substantial drops in operating speeds.

Level of Service E (LOS E) cannot be described by speed alone, but represents operations at even lower operating speeds than in Level D, with volumes at or near the capacity of the highway. Flow is unstable, and there may be stoppages of momentary duration.

Level of Service F (LOS F) describes forced flow operation at low speeds, where volumes are below capacity. These conditions usually result from queues of vehicles backing up from a restriction downstream. Speeds are reduced substantially and stoppages may occur for short or long periods of time because of the downstream congestion. In the extreme, both speeds and volume can drop to zero.

LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS (Traffic Signal Controlled)

Level of Service A is unobstructed flow; no approach signal phase is fully utilized by traffic and no vehicle waits longer than one red indication.

Level of Service B is stable operation; an occasional approach signal phase is fully utilized and a substantial number are approaching full use.

Level of Service C is stable operation with intermittent loading, relatively frequently. Occasionally, drivers may have to wait through more than one signal indication, and backups may development behind turning vehicles.

Level of Service D shows delays to approaching vehicles may be substantial during short periods during the peak period, with periodic clearance of developing queues.

Level of Service E shows unstable flow conditions with long queues over extended periods. Capacity occurs at the limit of this level.

Level of Service F shows forced flow conditions, with demand exceeding capacity; highly variable delay and long backups.

ROUTE SEGMENT DATA
****

DISTRICT: 5 COUNTY: MON ROUTE: 068

SEGMENT NUMBER: 1 P.M.: 0.0 to P.M.: L4.3 LENGTH: 4.3

DESCRIPTION: Asilamar State Park to 0.5 mi. east of Fairgrounds Rd. O.C.

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: Principal Arterial

FEDERAL AID CLASSIFICATION: Urban

TYPE OF FACILITY: Conventional

TYPE OF TERRAIN: Rolling

NUMBER OF TRAFFIC LANES: 2 & 4

LANE WIDTH: 11' to 14' SHOULDER WIDTH: 3' to 8'

R/W WIDTH: 100' MEDIAN WIDTH: 0'

ADT (Present,1990): 27,000

ADT (Future,2010): 40,000

PEAK HOUR VOLUME (Present): 3,000

DIRECTIONAL SPLIT: 55%

HOURS DELAY, P.M. PEAK: Not Available

V/C RATIO: 1.28* LOS: F* % TRUCKS: 4%

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: 4

ACCIDENT RATE: 2.81 FAT: 0.022 F&I: 1.14

COMP. STWIDE ACC. RATE: 2.68 FAT: 0.051 F&I: 1.22

PROPOSED ROUTE CONCEPT (2010): 4-Lane Facility

ROUTE CONCEPT LOS (2010): F-25

ANTICIPATED LOS (2010): F-20

Exhibit No.: 1

ROUTE SEGMENT DATA

DISTRICT: 5 COUNTY: MON ROUTE: 068

SEGMENT NUMBER: 2 P.M.: R4.0 to P.M.: 19.4 LENGTH: 15.4

DESCRIPTION: 0.5 mi. east of Fairgrounds Rd. O.C. to Hunter Lane
(subsegment P.M. R4.0 to 10.4)

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: Ext. of Principal Arterial

FEDERAL AID CLASSIFICATION: Primary

TYPE OF FACILITY: Freeway & Conventional

TYPE OF TERRAIN: Flat & Rolling

NUMBER OF TRAFFIC LANES: 2 & 4

LANE WIDTH: 12' SHOULDER WIDTH: 5' to 8'

R/W WIDTH: 100' MEDIAN WIDTH: 0', & 4' to 20'

ADT (Present,1990): 20,000

ADT (Future,2010): 32,000

PEAK HOUR VOLUME (Present): 2,200

DIRECTIONAL SPLIT: 60%

HOURS DELAY, P.M. PEAK: Not Available

V/C RATIO: 0.91 LOS: F* % TRUCKS: 4%

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: 0

ACCIDENT RATE: 1.03 FAT: 0.008 F&I: 0.53

COMP. STWIDE ACC. RATE: 2.62 FAT: 0.046 F&I: 1.18

PROPOSED ROUTE CONCEPT (2010): 4-lane Freeway

ROUTE CONCEPT LOS (2010): C-45

ANTICIPATED LOS (2010): F-20 without any improvement
B-50 with concept improvement

Exhibit No.: 2A

ROUTE SEGMENT DATA

DISTRICT: 5 COUNTY: MON ROUTE: 068

SEGMENT NUMBER: 2 P.M.: R4.0 to P.M.: 19.4 LENGTH: 15.4

DESCRIPTION: 0.5 mi. east of Fairgrounds Rd. O.C. to Hunter Lane
(subsegment P.M. 10.4 to R17.2)

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: Principal Arterial

FEDERAL AID CLASSIFICATION: Primary

TYPE OF FACILITY: Freeway & Conventional

TYPE OF TERRAIN: Rolling

NUMBER OF TRAFFIC LANES: 2 & 4

LANE WIDTH: 12' SHOULDER WIDTH: 5' to 8'

R/W WIDTH: 100' MEDIAN WIDTH: 0', & 10' to 46'

ADT (Present,1990): 20,000

ADT (Future,2010): 32,000

PEAK HOUR VOLUME (Present): 2,200

DIRECTIONAL SPLIT: 60%

HOURS DELAY, P.M. PEAK: Not Available

V/C RATIO: 0.85 LOS: F* % TRUCKS: 3%

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: 0

ACCIDENT RATE: 1.46 FAT: 0.031 F&I: 0.63

COMP. STWIDE ACC. RATE: 1.32 FAT: 0.051 F&I: 0.69

PROPOSED ROUTE CONCEPT (2010): 4-lane Freeway

ROUTE CONCEPT LOS (2010): C-45

ANTICIPATED LOS (2010): F-30 without any improvement
B-50 with concept improvement

Exhibit No.: 2B

ROUTE SEGMENT DATA
****

DISTRICT: 5 COUNTY: MON ROUTE: 068

SEGMENT NUMBER: 2 P.M.: R4.0 to P.M.: 19.4 LENGTH: 15.4

DESCRIPTION: 0.5 mi. east of Fairgrounds Rd. O.C. to Hunter Lane
(subsegment P.M. R17.2 to 19.4)

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: Principal Arterial

FEDERAL AID CLASSIFICATION: Primary

TYPE OF FACILITY: Freeway & Conventional

TYPE OF TERRAIN: Flat & Rolling

NUMBER OF TRAFFIC LANES: 4

LANE WIDTH: 12' SHOULDER WIDTH: 8'

R/W WIDTH: 200' MEDIAN WIDTH: 16' to 46'

ADT (Present,1990): 26,000

ADT (Future,2010): 37,000

PEAK HOUR VOLUME (Present): 2,900

DIRECTIONAL SPLIT: 60%

HOURS DELAY, P.M. PEAK: Not Available

V/C RATIO: 0.53 LOS: C % TRUCKS: 3%

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: 0

ACCIDENT RATE: 0.74 FAT: 0.00 F&I: 0.24

COMP. STWIDE ACC. RATE: 0.90 FAT: 0.025 F&I: 0.42

PROPOSED ROUTE CONCEPT (2010): 4-lane Freeway

ROUTE CONCEPT LOS (2010): C-45

ANTICIPATED LOS (2010): C-45

Exhibit No.: 2C

ROUTE SEGMENT DATA
****

DISTRICT: 5 COUNTY: MON ROUTE: 068

SEGMENT NUMBER: 3 P.M.: 19.4 to P.M.: 22.0 LENGTH: 2.6

DESCRIPTION: Hunter Lane to Jct. Rte 101

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: Ext. of Rural Principal Arterial

FEDERAL AID CLASSIFICATION: Primary

TYPE OF FACILITY: Conventional

TYPE OF TERRAIN: Flat

NUMBER OF TRAFFIC LANES: 2 & 4

LANE WIDTH: 12' & 13' SHOULDER WIDTH: 8'

R/W WIDTH: 100' MEDIAN WIDTH: 0', & 16' to 20'

ADT (Present,1990): 23,000

ADT (Future,2010): 28,000

PEAK HOUR VOLUME (Present): 2,700

DIRECTIONAL SPLIT: 55%

HOURS DELAY, P.M. PEAK: Not Available

V/C RATIO: 0.93 LOS: E % TRUCKS: 12%

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: 11

ACCIDENT RATE: 6.47 FAT: 0.017 F&I: 0.86

COMP. STWIDE ACC. RATE: 3.81 FAT: 0.033 F&I: 1.47

PROPOSED ROUTE CONCEPT (2010): No Significant Change

ROUTE CONCEPT LOS (2010): E-30

ANTICIPATED LOS (2010): F-20

Exhibit No.: 3

ROUTE SEGMENT DATA
****

DISTRICT: 5 COUNTY: MON ROUTE: 068

SEGMENT NUMBER: 1 P.M.: 0.0 to P.M.: L4.3 LENGTH: 4.3

DESCRIPTION: Asilamar State Park to 0.5 mi. east of Fairgrounds Rd. O.C.

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: Principal Arterial

FEDERAL AID CLASSIFICATION: Urban

TYPE OF FACILITY: Conventional

TYPE OF TERRAIN: Rolling

NUMBER OF TRAFFIC LANES: 2 & 4

LANE WIDTH: 11' to 14' SHOULDER WIDTH: 3' to 8'

R/W WIDTH: 100' MEDIAN WIDTH: 0'

ADT (Present, ~~1985~~ 1995): ~~24,000~~ 27,000

ADT (Future, ~~2005~~ 2010): ~~37,000~~ 40,000

PEAK HOUR VOLUME (Present): ~~2,700~~ 3,000

DIRECTIONAL SPLIT: 55%

HOURS DELAY, P.M. PEAK: Not Available

V/C RATIO: 1.28* LOS: F* % TRUCKS: 4%

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: 4

ACCIDENT RATE: ~~3.07~~ 2.81 **FAT:** ~~0.023~~ 0.021 **F&I:** ~~1.17~~ 1.14

COMP. STWIDE ACC. RATE: 2.68 **FAT:** ~~0.050~~ 0.046 **F&I:** ~~1.21~~ 1.22

PROPOSED ROUTE CONCEPT (2005): 4-Lane Facility

ROUTE CONCEPT LOS (2005): F-25

ANTICIPATED LOS (2005): F-20

Exhibit No.: 1

ROUTE SEGMENT DATA
****

DISTRICT: 5 COUNTY: MON ROUTE: 068

SEGMENT NUMBER: 2 P.M.: R4.0 to P.M.: 19.4 LENGTH: 15.4

DESCRIPTION: 0.5 mi. east of Fairgrounds Rd. O.C. to Hunter Lane (subsegment P.M. R4.0 to 10.4)

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: Ext. of Principal Arterial

FEDERAL AID CLASSIFICATION: Primary

TYPE OF FACILITY: Freeway & Conventional

TYPE OF TERRAIN: Flat & Rolling

NUMBER OF TRAFFIC LANES: 2 & 4

LANE WIDTH: 12' SHOULDER WIDTH: 5' to 8'

R/W WIDTH: 100' MEDIAN WIDTH: 0', & 4' to 20'

ADT (Present, ~~1985~~ 1990): ~~18,000~~ 20,000

ADT (Future, ~~2005~~ 2010): ~~31,000~~ 32,000

PEAK HOUR VOLUME (Present): ~~2,000~~ 2,-

DIRECTIONAL SPLIT: 60%

HOURS DELAY, P.M. PEAK: Not Available

V/C RATIO: ~~1.16*~~ 0.91 LOS: F* % TRUCKS: 4%

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: 0

ACCIDENT RATE: ~~1.12~~ 1.05 FAT: ~~0.033~~ 0.008 F&I: ~~0.48~~ 0.53

COMP. STWIDE ACC. RATE: 2.62 FAT: 0.046 F&I: 1.18

PROPOSED ROUTE CONCEPT (2005): 4-lane Freeway

ROUTE CONCEPT LOS (2005): C-45

ANTICIPATED LOS (2005): F-20 without any improvement
B-50 with concept improvement

Exhibit No.: 2A

ROUTE SEGMENT DATA
****

DISTRICT: 5 COUNTY: MON ROUTE: 068

SEGMENT NUMBER: 2 P.M.: R4.0 to P.M.: 19.4 LENGTH: 15.4

DESCRIPTION: 0.5 mi. east of Fairgrounds Rd. O.C. to Hunter Lane
(subsegment P.M. 10.4 to R17.2)

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: Principal Arterial

FEDERAL AID CLASSIFICATION: Primary

TYPE OF FACILITY: Freeway & Conventional

TYPE OF TERRAIN: Rolling

NUMBER OF TRAFFIC LANES: 2 & 4

LANE WIDTH: 12' SHOULDER WIDTH: 5' to 8'

R/W WIDTH: 100' MEDIAN WIDTH: 0', & 10' to 46'

ADT (Present, ~~1985~~ 1990): ~~18,400~~ 20000

ADT (Future, ~~2005~~ 2006): ~~31,000~~ 32,000

PEAK HOUR VOLUME (Present): ~~2,000~~ 2,000

DIRECTIONAL SPLIT: 60%

HOURS DELAY, P.M. PEAK: Not Available

V/C RATIO: ~~1.08*~~ 0.85 LOS: F* % TRUCKS: 3%

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: 0

ACCIDENT RATE: ~~1.19~~ 1.46 FAT: ~~0.015~~ 0.051 F&I: ~~0.55~~ 0.63

COMP. STWIDE ACC. RATE: ~~1.31~~ 1.32 FAT: ~~0.050~~ 0.051 F&I: ~~0.68~~ 0.69

PROPOSED ROUTE CONCEPT (2005): 4-lane Freeway

ROUTE CONCEPT LOS (2005): C-45

ANTICIPATED LOS (2005): F-30 without any improvement
B-50 with concept improvement

Exhibit No.: 2B

ROUTE SEGMENT DATA
****

DISTRICT: 5 COUNTY: MON ROUTE: 068

SEGMENT NUMBER: 2 P.M.: R4.0 to P.M.: 19.4 LENGTH: 15.4

DESCRIPTION: 0.5 mi. east of Fairgrounds Rd. O.C. to Hunter Lane (subsegment P.M. R17.2 to 19.4)

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: Principal Arterial

FEDERAL AID CLASSIFICATION: Primary

TYPE OF FACILITY: Freeway & Conventional

TYPE OF TERRAIN: Flat & Rolling

NUMBER OF TRAFFIC LANES: 4

LANE WIDTH: 12' SHOULDER WIDTH: 8'

R/W WIDTH: 200' MEDIAN WIDTH: 16' to 46'

ADT (Present, ~~1985~~ 1992): ~~23,500~~ 26,000

ADT (Future, ~~2005~~ 2020): ~~37,000~~ 37,000

PEAK HOUR VOLUME (Present): ~~2,600~~ 2,900

DIRECTIONAL SPLIT: 60%

HOURS DELAY, P.M. PEAK: Not Available

V/C RATIO: ~~0.45~~ 0.53 LOS: C % TRUCKS: 3%

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: 0

ACCIDENT RATE: ~~0.40~~ 0.74 FAT: 0.00 ✓ F&I: ~~0.10~~ 0.24

COMP. STWIDE ACC. RATE: 0.90 ✓ FAT: ~~0.024~~ 0.025 F&I: ~~0.41~~ 0.42

PROPOSED ROUTE CONCEPT (2005): 4-lane Freeway

ROUTE CONCEPT LOS (2005): C-45

ANTICIPATED LOS (2005): C-45

Exhibit No.: 2C

ROUTE SEGMENT DATA
****

DISTRICT: 5 COUNTY: MON ROUTE: 068

SEGMENT NUMBER: 3 P.M.: 19.4 to P.M.: 22.0 LENGTH: 2.6

DESCRIPTION: Hunter Lane to Jct. Rte 101

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: Ext. of Rural Principal Arterial

FEDERAL AID CLASSIFICATION: Primary

TYPE OF FACILITY: Conventional

TYPE OF TERRAIN: Flat

NUMBER OF TRAFFIC LANES: 2 & 4

LANE WIDTH: 12' & 13' SHOULDER WIDTH: 8'

R/W WIDTH: 100' MEDIAN WIDTH: 0', & 16' to 20'

ADT (Present, ~~1985~~ 2010): ~~22,000~~ 23,000

ADT (Future, 2005 2010): ~~27,000~~ 27,000

PEAK HOUR VOLUME (Present): ~~2,600~~ 2,700

DIRECTIONAL SPLIT: 55%

HOURS DELAY, P.M. PEAK: Not Available

V/C RATIO: 0.93 LOS: E % TRUCKS: ~~12%~~ 6%

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS: 11

ACCIDENT RATE: ~~5.68~~ 6.47 FAT: 0.017 ✓ F&I: ~~0.84~~ 0.86

COMP. STWIDE ACC. RATE: ~~3.77~~ 3.81 FAT: 0.033 ✓ F&I: ~~1.46~~ 1.47

PROPOSED ROUTE CONCEPT (2005): No Significant Change

ROUTE CONCEPT LOS (2005): E-30

ANTICIPATED LOS (2005): F-20

Exhibit No.: 3